



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 09/216,206 | 12/18/98 | KAY | H EWG-079 |

025181
FOLEY, HOAG & ELIOT, LLP
PATENT GROUP
ONE POST OFFICE SQUARE
BOSTON MA 02109

TM11/1120

| | |
|-----------------------|--------------|
| EXAMINER | |
| MYHRE, J | |
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| 2162 | J |
| DATE MAILED: 11/20/00 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

| | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 09/216,206 | Applicant(s) KAY et al |
| | Examiner James Myhre | Group Art Unit 2162 |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) James Myhre

(3) Heidi Kay

(2) Edward J. Kelly

(4) _____

Date of Interview Nov 17, 2000

Type: Telephonic Personal (copy is given to applicant applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: Yes No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement was reached. was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-13

Identification of prior art discussed:

Hanson (5,974,398) and Gerace (5,991,735)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant and Applicant's Representative discussed the differences between the claimed method of calculating how the advertiser adjusts subsequent bids taking into account the effectiveness of the advertisement site and the methods disclosed in the references for adjusting the advertisement campaign. Emphasis was placed on evaluating the effectiveness of the advertisement on a specific site as opposed an evaluation based on how effective a particular advertisement was overall. The Examiner disagreed that this feature was not shown in or been obvious from the prior art. The Examiner noted that there was an outstanding amendment in the application and stated that his position would be more clearly defined in the office action responding to that amendment.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

James W. MYHRE

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Off

JAMES P. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100